IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.RAMKUMAR

THURSDAY, THE 6TH SEPTEMBER 2007 / 15TH BHADRA 1929

Crl.Rev.Pet.No. 3250 of 2007()

CRA.272/2003 of ADDL.SESSIONS JUDGE(ADHOC-II), KASARAGOD
CC.688/2000 of CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, KASARAGOD

.....

REVN. PETITIONER:

LALITHA THOMAS, AGED 37 YEARS
W/O.THOMAS, RESIDING AT ALILAKUZHIYIL
PULIKURUMBA POST, NADUVIL,
KANNUR DISTRICT

BY ADV. SRI.KODOTH SREEDHARAN

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. K.SUNDARA, S/O.BABU
MECHANIC RESIDING AT ADKATHBAIL
GUTHU ROAD, KASARAGOD, KASBA.

2. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY
PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM

BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 06/09/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

V. RAMKUMAR, J.

Crl. R.P. No. 3250 OF 2007

Dated this the 6th day of September, 2007

O R D E R

In this Revision filed under Section 397 read with Sec. 401 Cr.P.C. the petitioner who was the accused in C.C. No.688/2000 on the file of the CJM, Kasaragod, challenges the conviction entered and the sentence passed against her for an offence punishable under Sec. 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act').

2. I heard the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner and the learned Public Prosecutor.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the Revision Petitioner re-iterated the contentions in support of the Revision. The courts below have concurrently held that the cheque in question was drawn by the revision petitioner in favour of the complainant on the drawee bank, that the cheque was validly presented to the bank, that it was dishonoured for reasons which fall under Section 138 of the Act, that the complainant made a demand for payment by a notice in time in accordance with clause (b) of the proviso to Section 138 of the Act and that the Revision Petitioner/accused failed to make the payment within 15 days of receipt of the statutory notice. Both the courts have considered and rejected the defence set up by the revision petitioner while entering the above finding. The said finding has been recorded

on an appreciation of the oral and documentary evidence. I do not find any error, illegality or impropriety in the finding so recorded concurrently by the courts below. The conviction was thus rightly entered against the petitioner.

4. What now survives for consideration is the question as to whether a proper sentence has been imposed on the Revision Petitioner. I am, however, inclined to modify the sentence imposed on the revision petitioner provided she complies with the condition hereinafter mentioned. Accordingly, if the revision petitioner pays to the 1st respondent complainant by way of compensation under section 357 (3) Cr.P.C. a sum of Rs.1,50,000/- (Rupees one lakh and fifty thousand only) within four months from today, then she need to undergo only imprisonment till the rising of the court. If on the other hand, the revision petitioner commits default in making the payment as aforesaid, she shall undergo simple imprisonment for three months by way of default sentence. Money, if any, paid by the revision petitioner pursuant to the orders, if any, passed by the lower appellate court shall be refunded to the revision petitioner.

This Revision is disposed of confirming the conviction but modifying the sentence as above.

(V. RAMKUMAR, JUDGE)

aks